



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/1091
23 September 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 22 SEPTEMBER 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF AFGHANISTAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to enclose the text of a statement of the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, dated 20 September 1994, in relation to the situation in Tajikistan (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Ravan FARHADI
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

Statement dated 20 September 1994 by the spokesman of the Ministry
of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic State of Afghanistan on the
recent political developments in Tajikistan

On the basis of its foreign policy of adhering to peace and striving for good-neighbourly relations, the Islamic State of Afghanistan has always desired the consolidation of stability in the region and welcomes the recent agreements between the Government of Tajikistan and the Tajik opposition calling for a cease-fire and considers it as a preliminary stage for a politically advantageous solution to the internal problems in Tajikistan.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic State of Afghanistan hopes that on the basis of the recent agreement the stage of negotiation to be held in Islamabad leads to full agreement and, in this way, an efficacious and comprehensive solution can be found to a painful and difficult problem in the neighbouring country of Afghanistan.

The Islamic State of Afghanistan, following its constructive stand on the question, is declaring, once again, its complete readiness to serve in a speedy peace process leading to stability in our neighbouring country of Tajikistan.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/1092
24 September 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 22 SEPTEMBER 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF KOREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The Korean Armistice Agreement was signed on 27 July 1953, between the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers side and the "United Nations Command (UNC)" side with the objectives of ensuring "a complete cessation of hostile activities and all acts of armed force in Korea in order to cease conflicts", and the Military Armistice Commission (MAC) and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC) were organized and conducted their activities for the implementation of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement.

The Armistice mechanism, however, has not been able to carry out its functions due to the systematic violation of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement by the United States side.

The Military Armistice Commission (MAC) has ceased its function since 25 March 1991 as a result of the illegal appointment of the south Korean army "general" to the position of the chief delegate of the "United Nations Command" by the United States side and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC) has also become a worthless body.

I. VIOLATIONS OF THE ARMISTICE AGREEMENT AND PARALYSATION OF THE ARMISTICE MECHANISM BY THE UNITED STATES

The United States, a real party to the Armistice Agreement, has systematically violated the provisions of this Agreement over the last 40 years.

Having signed the Armistice Agreement on 27 July 1953, the United States, in violation of the provisions of the Agreement, concluded in October of that year the "USA-ROK Mutual Defense Assistance Treaty" with the south Korean authorities in an effort to legalize the United States military presence in south Korea.

On 7 November 1955, the United States side shot down a helicopter flying to Kimpo airport on a regular inspection mission of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, killing three Polish delegates of the Commission.

On 9 June 1956, the United States forced the Neutral Nations Inspection Teams to withdraw from the designated ports of entry in the United Nations Command-controlled area where the Teams had been stationed in accordance with Section C of Article II of the Armistice Agreement, because the Teams were observing and reporting the violations of the Agreement by the United States.

It was since then that the NNSC was not able to carry out its missions mandated by the Armistice Agreement.

On 21 June 1957, following the expulsion of the on-site Inspection Teams, the United States declared a unilateral non-compliance with subparagraph 13 (d) of the Armistice Agreement which ruled out the introduction into Korea of the reinforcing operational material. Subparagraph 13 (d) of the Armistice Agreement stipulated that the opposing sides "cease the introduction into Korea of reinforcing combat aircraft, armoured vehicles, weapons, and ammunition".

This is how the United States paved the way for unbridled arms build up in south Korea. After they removed the legal obstacles in their arms build up in south Korea the United States introduced into south Korea large quantities of various sophisticated weapons, including 1,000 nuclear weapons without any restrictions. And in 1994 they even introduced the patriot missiles and modern combat armaments into south Korea.

It is none other than the United States that is responsible for the "USS Pueblo Incident", the "EC-121 Spyplane Incident" and the "Panmunjom Incident" - incidents that precipitated the situation on the Korean peninsula to the brink of war, thus focusing the world's attention on the peninsula.

To make matters worse, on 25 March 1991, the United States unilaterally designated a south Korean army "general" as the chief delegate of the United Nations Forces to the Military Armistice Commission, despite his apparent disqualification.

The south Korean military did not join the "United Nations Forces" during the Korean war and strongly refused to sign the Armistice Agreement and now does not have any operational command power over all the military forces in south Korea. Therefore, any transfer of control over the armistice mechanism to the south Korean military delegate is absolutely irrelevant both in legal and practical terms, and cannot be viewed otherwise than an action aimed at wrecking the armistice arrangement.

This is an open perfidy of paralysing the military armistice mechanism and ignoring and ridiculing the other signatory of the Armistice Agreement. In response to this, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had no choice but to recall its chief delegate to the Military Armistice Commission.

Such an irresponsible behaviour on the part of the United States has only invalidated the provisions of the Armistice Agreement essential for preventing the recurrence of war and put the Agreement-implementing bodies out of operation. Consequently, the Military Armistice Commission has turned into a nominal body in which its legitimate component parties ceased to exist, and the

/...

Armistice Agreement has been reduced to blank sheets of paper incapable of helping to ensure peace on the Korean peninsula.

The present-day reality is that both arms build up and recurrence of war cannot be prevented by the obsolete armistice mechanism, which has turned out to be a tool of cold war policy.

II. THE OBSOLETE ARMISTICE MECHANISM SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH A NEW PEACE MECHANISM

The continued accountability of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the United States to the Armistice Agreement and absence of a new security arrangement for practically guaranteeing peace are responsible for the uncertainty of the situation that has continued on the Korean peninsula since the end of the Korean war. In other words, the uncertainty of the situation remains in place because the cold war structure has failed to give way to the structure of rapprochement on the Korean peninsula.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Armistice Agreement has established the relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States - the real parties to the Agreement - as hostile relations.

In order to create new peaceful relations replacing such hostile relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, it is essential to terminate the cease-fire arrangement, which is the typical legacy of the cold war era, and develop a new peace arrangement. This will help to eliminate the threat of an alleged "southward invasion" and a perceived "northward invasion" and to establish new relations of both rapprochement and mutual confidence between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, relations that will dissipate confrontation and mistrust.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has already recommended to the United States more than once through channels of contacts to consider instituting a new security arrangement, rather than maintaining the status quo of the armistice arrangement or reviving the inoperative cease-fire mechanism.

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has, through the 28 April 1994 Statement of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, proposed to the United States that the two countries hold negotiations for the establishment of a new peace arrangement which will replace the obsolete armistice mechanism, with a view to converting the armistice agreement into a peace agreement and took measures of recalling its delegation from MAC and setting up Panmunjom Mission of the Korean People's Army as a negotiating machine, a practical one to carry into effect the proposal.

In response to this, the Government of the People's Republic of China has decided to withdraw the delegation of the Chinese People's Volunteers from the MAC.

The measures taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are the most reasonable and fair ones in view of the present state of cease-fire

/...

mechanisms and of the tense situation created in the Korean peninsula by the continuous war manoeuvres of the United States and south Korea and in view of the implementation of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its thirtieth session, calling for the dissolution of the "United Nations Command" in south Korea. And they are the sincere and good-minded measures to maintain durable peace in the Korean peninsula.

An intention to maintain the state of cease-fire even in the present post-cold war era will be understood to be the intention to continue the cold war policy on the Korean peninsula. It will also be regarded as the intention to move towards confrontation and war, instead of peace and stability.

In the final analysis, the long-standing hostile relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States have spawned crucial issues including the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula, plunging efforts to resolve the issues into impasse.

If the two countries had already ceased to be hostile to each other and normalized their relations, they would never have found themselves faced with these issues at all and even if certain issues might have occurred, they could have resolved them without difficulty in an atmosphere of confidence. After all, the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula, too, will be resolved smoothly only when it is addressed on a package approach in the perspective of overall relationship between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States.

The current situation on the Korean peninsula calls for an early termination of the armistice regime. There is no need for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States to remain hostile nations, simply on the ground that they once fought a war.

At the first round of bilateral talks in June 1993, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States agreed to the principles of non-aggression, an indication that the two countries have recognized the need to do so. And at the third round of talks in August 1994, the two sides agreed to normalize the relations between the two countries. Such being the case, there are no conditions that prevent the United States from legally terminating the state of cease-fire and improving its relations with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Clinging to the continuous maintenance of the state of cease-fire, a leftover of the cold war, at the time when the normalization of relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States is under discussion, is an anachronistic act against peace. When a new peace arrangement is established between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, a decisive favourable condition will be created for the implementation of the north-south agreement whose main core is non-aggression.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) PAK Gil Yon
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/1093
24 September 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 23 SEPTEMBER 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED
TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit, herewith, a message addressed to Your Excellency from H.E. Dr. Ali Akbar Velayati the Foreign Minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran dated 21 September 1994, concerning the situation in Tajikistan.

It would be highly appreciated if this letter and its annex were circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Kamal KHARRAZI
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

Message dated 21 September from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of
the Islamic Republic of Iran addressed to the Secretary-General

In light of the policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran to assist the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Tajikistan, I have the pleasure to inform you that following a period of lull in the process of negotiation for national reconciliation, a round of talks called "Political consultations for continuation of national reconciliation negotiations in Tajikistan" was held in Tehran from 12 to 17 September 1994, thanks to Your Excellency's good offices and the efforts of the Islamic Republic of Iran. These talks were conducted under the supervision of your special envoy, H.E. Mr. Ramiro Piriz-Ballon, and representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Russian Federation and Pakistan participated as observers.

I am pleased to announce that the political consultations in Tehran were quite fruitful and paved the way for the success of efforts aimed at peaceful resolution of crisis and establishment of durable peace in Tajikistan. One of the developments of these talks was the direct negotiations between high level representatives of the parties involved in Tajikistan crisis which took place in a climate of understanding - a development which constitutes a first-time achievement in the process of negotiation for national reconciliation in Tajikistan. These talks resulted in the signing of an agreement for provisional cease-fire, cessation of hostile acts in Tajikistan and at borders with Afghanistan which will enter into force when the United Nations Observers are deployed to the area. In light of the sensitivity and importance of early return of peace and security to Tajikistan, I would hope to soon witness the dispatch of United Nations Observers.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, recognizing Your Excellency's valuable role in advancing the negotiations for national reconciliation in Tajikistan, underlines the grave responsibility of the United Nations Organization in devising an effective mechanism for supervision of cease-fire and making efforts to extend it until final solution has been achieved. In this connection, the Islamic Republic of Iran announces its continued preparedness to extend assistance to the efforts of the United Nations.

We can now happily pronounce that Tehran negotiations and its results were a turning point in the process of peaceful resolution of conflict in Tajikistan and represents a successful attempt in general peace-making.

In conclusion, I would like to highlight and to commend the helpful and effective role H.E. Mr. Ramiro Piriz-Ballon, your special envoy for Tajikistan, played in securing so important an achievement.

I trust the outcome of Tehran negotiations will serve the interests of the peoples of Tajikistan, region and the world.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Dr. Ali Akbar Velayati
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Islamic Republic of Iran



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/1094
27 September 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 19 SEPTEMBER 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF GERMANY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In my capacity as representative of the Presidency of the European Union I have the honour to transmit to you the text of a statement of the European Union issued on 15 September 1994 on the situation in Nagorny Karabakh (see annex).

I should be grateful if you could have the text of the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Detlev GRAF ZU RANTZAU
Ambassador

Annex

[Original: English and French]

Statement by the Presidency issued on 15 September 1994 on behalf
of the European Union on the situation in Nagorny Karabakh

The European Union welcomes with great satisfaction the recent statements by the leaderships of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Nagorny Karabakh made during the visit of the Head of the CSCE Minsk Group, Ambassador Eliasson, to the region. In those statements, the parties to the conflict confirmed their commitment to uphold the cease-fire until an agreement on the settlement of the conflict has been concluded. The European Union further welcomes the official declarations issued on this matter by the Governments of Armenia and Azerbaijan as well as the authorities in Stepanakert.

The European Union considers this an important step in consolidating the cease-fire and approaching a political solution. It thanks the CSCE Minsk Group for its efforts in bringing about these statements and renews its support for the Group's work, which is indispensable for the way towards peace in Nagorny Karabakh. The European Union expresses its sincere hope that the Minsk conference can be convened in the near future.

Finally, the European Union hopes that the parties to the conflict also show restraint in public declarations. The European Union furthermore encourages continued direct contacts between the parties in order to create a more friendly and psychologically favourable atmosphere for the continuation of the negotiations.

The four acceding countries associate themselves with this declaration.
